



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SO

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,425	07/28/2001	Michael S. Allison	10018218-1	4633

22879 7590 07/11/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/918,425

Applicant(s)

ALLISON ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/17/04.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: request for continued examination, filed 6 June 2005, to the original application filed 28 July 2001.
2. The rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
3. The rejection of claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) in view of Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
4. The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503), Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1) and Marso (U.S. Publication 2002/0078349 A1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.
5. The rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) and Bice (U.S. Publication 2002/0188688 A1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

Art Unit: 2176

6. The rejection of claims 10-12 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) and Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

7. The rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503), Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) and Ciccone (U.S. Patent 6,338,149 B1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

8. The rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503), Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) and Bouchier (U.S. Patent 6,684,343 B1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

9. The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503), Hansen (U.S. Publication 2002/0143575 A1) and Bice (U.S. Publication 2002/0188688 A1) has been removed as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

10. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rock (U.S. Patent 6,524,245 B1) in view of Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503).

As per claims 1 and 2, Rock discloses a method for analyzing events from electronic architecture, which are equivalent to data contained in chassis logs, noting that "chassis logs" are defined in the Instant Application as "events from internal entities to specify system health during boot up and operation" (See Instant Application, Page 1, paragraph 0003). Rock also discloses automatically processing data associated with the events (See Rock, Column 1, lines 49-60), transforming the data to human interpretable statements (See Rock, Column 3, lines 62-67, and Column 4, lines 1-27), summarizing the data (See Rock, Column 2, lines 56-63), setting forth one or more of the problems/errors (See Rock, Column 3, lines 5-8), and that the data is specific to boot-up and operation of the electronic architecture (See Rock, Column 3, lines 54-61, and Column 8, Appendix I). Rock does not disclose expressly that the data is in the form of a text string. Kleinman discloses processing into English text strings associated with system messages (See Kleinman, Column 9, lines 22-31). Rock and Kleinman are

analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of electronic exception handling processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the text strings of Kleinman with the method of Rock. The motivation for doing so would have been to log or to display to a user the reason why a system request has failed (See Kleinman, Column 3, lines 46-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kleinman with Rock for the benefit of logging or displaying to a user the reason why a system request has failed to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 2.

As per claim 3, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rock also discloses that the processing step includes processing the data corresponding to software associated with the data, which is one of the possible entities set forth in claim 3 (See Rock, Column 3, lines 55-61).

As per claim 4, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 3 as described above. Rock also discloses processing data representative of one or more messages of the one or more entities, which are equivalent to "chassis codes", defined in the Instant Application as "a series of one or more small messages" (See Instant Application, Page 1, paragraph 0003) (See Rock, Column 3, lines 52-61).

As per claim 6, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Rock also discloses processing problem details of the chassis codes (See Rock, Column 3, lines 62-67, and Column 4, lines 1-14).

As per claim 7, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Rock also discloses executing an embedded program with one of the

Art Unit: 2176

chassis codes as an argument, to further analyze problems associated with the one entity (See Rock, Column 3, lines 62-67, and Column 4, lines 1-42).

As per claim 8, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rock also discloses printing the statement via a fax (See Rock, Column 4, lines 39-42).

As per claim 9, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rock also discloses automatically emailing at least part of the statement to some email destination (See Rock, Column 4, lines 34-42).

As per claim 10, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Rock also discloses acquiring the data from an extraction tool coupled to the architecture (See Rock, Column 4, lines 21-29, and Column 2, lines 24-31).

As per claim 11, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 10 as described above. Rock also discloses extracting the chassis logs from the architecture, separating the chassis logs according to the entities, and transforming the chassis logs to one or more text strings (See Rock, Column 4, lines 9-20).

As per claim 12, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Rock also discloses accessing one or more analyzers coupled to the extraction tool (See Rock, Column 5, lines 7-12).

As per claim 13, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Rock also discloses utilizing a graphical user interface coupled to one or more of the analyzers (See Rock, Column 2, lines 64-67, and Column 3, lines 1-3).

As per claim 14, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 12 as described above. Rock also discloses processing text strings associated with one of the entities (See Rock, Column 3, lines 5-8).

As per claim 15, Rock discloses a system for analyzing data associated with events from electronic architecture, which are equivalent to data contained in chassis logs, noting that "chassis logs" are defined in the Instant Application as "events from internal entities to specify system health during boot up and operation" (See Instant Application, Page 1, paragraph 0003). Rock discloses that the system includes one or more analyzers for analyzing the text strings and for producing a human interpretable statement about one or more of the chassis logs, each of the analyzers associated with one or the entities associated with software (See Rock, Column 5, lines 7-12, lines 44-51, and Column 3, lines 54-61). Rock also discloses including an interface for coupling the analyzers to an extraction tool acquiring the chassis logs from the architecture (See Rock, Column 3, lines 44-54). Rock does not disclose expressly that the data is in the form of a text string. Kleinman discloses processing into English text strings associated with system messages (See Kleinman, Column 9, lines 22-31). Rock and Kleinman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of electronic exception handling processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the text strings of Kleinman with the method of Rock. The motivation for doing so would have been to log or to display to a user the reason why a system request has failed (See Kleinman, Column 3, lines 46-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kleinman with Rock for the benefit of

logging or displaying to a user the reason why a system request has failed to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

As per claim 16, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Rock also discloses that the chassis logs include chassis codes from one or more of the entities, noting that "chassis codes" are defined in the Instant Application as "a series of one or more small messages" (See Instant Application, Page 1, paragraph 0003) (See Rock, Column 3, lines 52-61) (See Rock, Column 3, line 67, and Column 4, lines 1-3).

As per claim 17, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Rock also discloses extracting the chassis logs from the architecture, separating the chassis logs according to the entities, and transforming the chassis logs to one or more text strings (See Rock, Column 4, lines 9-20).

As per claim 18, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Rock also discloses processing problem details of the chassis codes (See Rock, Column 3, lines 62-67, and Column 4, lines 1-14).

As per claim 19, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 18 as described above. Rock also discloses executing an embedded program with one of the chassis codes as an argument, to further analyze problems associated with the one entity (See Rock, Column 3, lines 62-67, and Column 4, lines 1-42).

As per claim 20, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 15 as described above. Rock also discloses that the interface publishes the statement in the form of email (See Rock, Column 4, lines 34-42).

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rock (U.S. Patent 6,524,245 B1) in view of Kleinman (U.S. Patent 5,724,503) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Hahn (U.S. Patent 6,725,446 B1).

As per claim 5, Rock and Kleinman disclose the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Rock and Kleinman do not disclose expressly parsing the chassis codes and sequentially processing each of the chassis codes. Hahn discloses parsing data fields sequentially into a message for transmission (See Hahn, Column 3, lines 63-66). Rock, Kleinman and Hahn are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of electronic exception handling processing. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the parsing and sequential processing of messages of Hahn with the method of Rock and Kleinman. The motivation for doing so would have been to transfer data associated with error correcting so that a client has the most recent information (See Hahn, Column 3, lines 44-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hahn with Rock and Kleinman for the benefit of transferring data associated with error correcting so that a client has the most recent information to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Eick (U.S. Patent 5,644,692) discloses information display apparatus and methods.
- Wetherell discloses error data values in the data-flow language VAL.
- McDaniel discloses an interactive tool for performance debugging.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

16. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/7/2005

Application/Control Number: 09/918,425
Art Unit: 2176

Page 11

LR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/7/2005